

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BENJAMIN ORTIZ,

No. C-11-03317 DMR

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER RE PRETRIAL DOCUMENT  
SUBMISSIONS**

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Defendant(s).  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

The court's Case Management and Pretrial Order required the parties to submit by May 25, 2012 *joint* proposed jury instructions and a *joint* proposed verdict form. Only if the parties could not agree on portions of these filings were they permitted to submit separate proposals. [Docket No. 14 at 4.] However, the parties submitted fully separate proposed jury instructions, and Plaintiff submitted no proposed verdict form. [Docket Nos. 47-48, 55.] The court therefore ORDERS the parties to meet and confer, and to submit a *joint* proposed verdict form and *joint* proposed jury instructions by June 7, 2012. If the court does not timely receive these documents, it will presume that Plaintiff does not oppose Defendants' proposed verdict form.

The Order also commanded the parties to submit *two* sets of *premarked* and *tabbed* exhibits. [Docket No. 14 at 5.] Plaintiff did not comply with these instructions. The court therefore ORDERS Plaintiff to submit his exhibits in proper form by June 7, 2012.


1 Furthermore, it appears from Plaintiff's pretrial submissions that he will not pursue a number  
2 of his claims, including his *Monnell* and state claims. The court ORDERS Plaintiff to file by June  
3 7, 2012 a statement of claims that he intends to pursue at trial.

4 Finally, the court ORDERS the parties to jointly submit a brief paragraph describing the case  
5 for the court to read to the jury as part of the preliminary jury instructions.

6 All filings shall be made in a searchable pdf format.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9  
10 Dated: June 5, 2012



11  
12 DONNA M. RYU  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28